# Low anisotropy of the upper critical field in a strongly anisotropic layered cuprate: Evidence for paramagnetically limited superconductivity

S. O. Katterwe[†],[1] A. Rydh,[1] Th. Jacobs,[1] A. Maljuk,[2] and V. M. Krasnov[1],[*]

[1] *Department of Physics, Stockholm University, AlbaNova University Center, SE-10691 Stockholm, Sweden*
[2] *Leibniz Institute for Solid State and Materials Research IFW Dresden, Helmholtzstr. 20, D-01171 Dresden, Germany*

(Dated: March 20, 2014)

We study angular-dependent magnetoresistance in a layered $Bi_{2.15}Sr_{1.9}CuO_{6+\delta}$ cuprate. The low $T_c \sim 4$ K allows complete suppression of superconductivity by modest magnetic fields and facilitates an accurate analysis of the fluctuation conductivity and a confident extraction of the upper critical field $H_{c2}(T)$. We observe that the anisotropy of $H_{c2}$ is surprisingly low $\sim 2$, much smaller than the effective mass anisotropy of the material $\sim 300$. We show that the anisotropy is decreasing with increasing field and saturates at a small value when the field reaches the paramagnetic limit. We argue that the dramatic discrepancy of high field and low field anisotropies is a clear evidence for paramagnetically limited superconductivity.

PACS numbers: 74.25.Op 74.72.Gh 74.40.-n 74.25.F-

arXiv:1403.4817v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 19 Mar 2014

The upper critical field $H_{c2}$ is one of the key parameters of type-II superconductors [1]. The knowledge of $H_{c2}$ is particularly important for understanding unconventional superconductivity [2]. However, estimation of $H_{c2}$ for high-temperature superconductors is a notoriously difficult task. The high $T_c$ leads to an extended thermally activated flux-flow region at $T < T_c(H)$. The complex physics of anisotropic pinning and melting of the vortex lattice makes it hard, if at all possible, to confidently obtain $H_{c2}$ from flux-flow characteristics.

The high $T_c$ in combination with a strong coupling lead to a large superconducting energy gap $\Delta \sim 20 - 50$ meV [3, 4] and $H_{c2}(0) \sim 10^2$ T [5–10]. Such strong fields alter the ground state of the material. Even relatively weak fields can induce a canted ferromagnetic order in strongly underdoped cuprates [11]. Furthermore, the normal state of underdoped cuprates is characterised by the presence of the pseudogap (PG), which probably represents a charge/spin or orbital density wave order coexisting and competing with superconductivity [3, 12, 13]. Suppression of superconductivity by magnetic field may enhance the competing PG, as follows from observation of the charge density wave order in vortex cores [4]. But even stronger magnetic fields of several hundred tesla suppress the PG [14, 15]. Thus, both superconducting and normal states respond significantly to magnetic fields and separation of the two contributions is highly non-trivial and controversial. Disentanglement of superconducting and PG magnetoresistances is difficult even above $T_c$ due to presence of profound superconducting fluctuations well above $T_c$ [16]. Therefore, principal new questions, which do not appear for low-$T_c$ superconductors, are to what extent $H \sim H_{c2}$ alters the abnormal normal state of high-$T_c$ superconductors and how to define the non-superconducting background in measured $(T, H)$-dependent characteristics.

For many unconventional superconductors the measured $H_{c2}$ exceeds the paramagnetic limit of the BCS theory [1]. This has been reported for organic [17, 18], cuprate [7, 8], pnictide [19, 20] and heavy fermion [21, 22] superconductors. Such an overshooting is an important hint in a long standing search for exotic spin-triplet and Fulde Ferrell Larkin Ovchinnikov states (for review see e.g. Ref.[22]). Yet, the overshooting is not a proof of unconventional pairing because the paramagnetic limit is rather flexible. It is increasing in the presence of spin-orbit interaction [1], significantly enhancing in the two-dimensional (2D) and is lifted in the one-dimensional (1D) case [22, 23]. Unconventional superconductors are usually anisotropic. Some of them have layered quasi-2D, or possibly even quasi-1D structure (cuprates and organic superconductors). Many have significant spin-orbit interaction between localized spins and itinerant charge carriers. Consequently, one needs a more robust criterion for the paramagnetically (un)limited superconductivity in search for exotic states of matter.

Here we investigate the anisotropy of $H_{c2}$ in an extremely anisotropic layered $Bi_{2.15}Sr_{1.9}CuO_{6+\delta}$ (Bi-2201) cuprate with a very low $T_c \sim 4$ K. The low $T_c$ and the associated large disparity of superconducting and pseudogap scales [15] in this compound allow simple and accurate estimation of $H_{c2}$ without complications typical for high-$T_c$ cuprates. Remarkably, we observed that $H_{c2}^{\parallel}/H_{c2}^{\perp}(T \to 0) \simeq 2$ is much smaller than the anisotropy of effective mass $\gamma_m \simeq 300$. This discrepancy clearly indicates that $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ parallel to the CuO planes is cut-off by the paramagnetic limit.

Bi-based cuprates, including Bi-2201, represent natural stacks of atomic-scale intrinsic Josephson junctions [15, 24]. This reflects the 2D nature of superconductivity, confined within the CuO (ab) planes. The out-of plane (c-axis) resistivity $\rho_c \sim$ 10-100 Ωcm is much larger than $\rho_{ab} \sim 10^{-4}$ Ωcm [25, 26] resulting in the extremely large resistive anisotropy $\gamma_R = \rho_c/\rho_{ab} \sim 10^5$-$10^6$ and an effective mass anisotropy $\gamma_m = \sqrt{\gamma_R} \sim$ 100-1000.

We present data for a nearly optimally doped crys-




FIG. 1. (Color online) (a) and (b) $T$-dependencies of the in-plane resistance at magnetic fields (a) perpendicular and (b) parallel to ab-planes. (c) Angular dependence of $R_{ab}$ at $T = 2$K for different magnetic fields. Dashed lines correspond to the Lorentz force free configuration at $\Theta = 0$. Solid lines correspond to the Lorentz force in the c-axis direction at $\Theta = 0$. Note narrowing of the cusp-like dip in $R_{ab}(\Theta = 0)$ at $H > H_{c2}^{\perp} \simeq 10$T. (d-f) Fluctuation part of conductivity versus $T$ in (d) perpendicular and (e) parallel magnetic fields and (f) versus perpendicular magnetic field at different $T$. Note an approximately linear decay in the semi-logarithmic scale. The shift of curves along the horizontal axis represents the $T_c(H)$ and $H_{c2}(T)$, respectively.

tal with $T_c \simeq 4.3$ K [OP(4.3)] and a slightly overdoped crystal with $T_c \simeq 4.0$ K [OD(4.0)]. Studied samples had several contact pads (mesas) micro-fabricated on top of a freshly cleaved Bi-2201 single crystal. Details of sample fabrication, sample characterization, and the experimental setup can be found in Ref. [15]. The growth and characterization of crystals is described in Ref. [27].

Figures 1 (a) and (b) show $T$-dependencies of the in-plane resistance $R_{ab}$ at different fields perpendicular (a) and parallel (b) to $ab$ planes. There is a clear anisotropy with respect to field orientation. It is seen that for $H \perp ab$, $R_{ab}$ reaches the normal state value at $H_{c2}^{\perp} \simeq 10$ T. For $H \parallel ab$ the field of 17 T still does not completely suppress the superconductivity. Those fields are much smaller than the PG closing field $\sim 300$ T [15]. This allows accurate analysis of superconducting characteristics not affected by interference with the co-existing PG.

Fig. 1 (c) shows angular dependencies of the in-plane resistance $R_{ab}(\Theta)$ at $T = 2$ K $< T_c$ for rotation around two orthogonal axes in the ab-plane. In both cases $\Theta = 90°$ corresponds to $H \perp ab$, $H \perp I$. But $\Theta = 0°$ corresponds to either the Lorentz force-free configuration $H \parallel ab \parallel I$ (dashed lines) or to the case $H \parallel ab$, $H \perp I$ (solid lines). In the latter case the Lorentz force is perpendicular to layers and is acting on Josephson-like vortices. It is seen that the behavior in both cases is very similar. Therefore, at $H \parallel ab$ the flux-flow contribution to $R_{ab}$ is small due to either zero Lorentz force or a strong intrinsic pinning in the layered superconductor [28–30], which prevents motion of Josephson vortices across the planes. The $R_{ab}(\Theta)$ exhibits a clear cusp-like dip at $\Theta = 0$, indicating the 2D-nature of superconductivity in the CuO planes. The dip becomes narrower with increasing field. This is particularly pronounced at $H > H_{c2}^{\perp} \simeq 10$ T. In this case the sample is in the normal state with a flat $R_{ab}(\Theta) \simeq R_n$, where $R_n$ is the normal state resistance, for angles $\Theta \sim 90°$ at which $H_{c2}(\Theta) < H$. As the field approaches the highest $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$, superconductivity survives only in a narrow range of angles around $\Theta \sim 0°$ where $H_{c2}(\Theta) > H$. Therefore, a significant narrowing of $R(\Theta = 0)$ dip at $H = 17$ T in Fig. 1 (c) indicates that $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ is close to 17 T.

The data in Figs. 1 (a-c) does contain information about $H_{c2}$. However, its extraction is complicated by the lack of criteria for the value of resistance at $H = H_{c2}$. Indeed, in the flux-flow case the resistivity can be approximately estimated as [1]

$$R = R_n \frac{H}{H_{c2}}. \qquad (1)$$

In this case $H = H_{c2}$ would correspond to the end of the resistive transition $R = R_n$. In the absence of flux-flow, however, $H_{c2}$ would correspond to the beginning of the resistive transition $R(H = H_{c2}) \gtrsim 0$. This is also the case for strong pinning, as demonstrated for Nb films [9]. Thus, $R(H = H_{c2})$ depends on pinning of vortices and is almost impossible to predict a priori. This is particularly relevant for layered superconductors with a large anisotropy of pinning. Without exact knowledge of the flux-flow contribution it is impossible to confidently extract $H_{c2}$ from $R(T, H)$ characteristics at $T < T_c$. Therefore, the main focus of our analysis will be on the fluctuation part at $T > T_c$, which does not suffer from ambiguity associated with vortex pinning.

The fluctuation para-conductivity [16] is apparently seen as a tail in $R_{ab}(T)$ at $T_c < T \lesssim 10$ K. Figures 1 (d) and (e) represent normalized excess conductivities $\Delta\sigma_{ab}(T) = 1/R_{ab}(T) - 1/R_n(T)$, in perpendicular and parallel to ab-planes magnetic fields, obtained from the data in Figs. 1 (a) and (b), respectively. In obtaining those plots we assumed $R_n^{\perp}(T) = R_{ab}(T, H^{\perp} = 14\ T)$ and $R_n^{\parallel}(T) = R_{ab}(T, H^{\parallel} = 17\ T)$. It is seen that for both field orientations the fluctuation conductivity at $T > T_c$ decreases approximately linearly in the semi-logarithmic scale with almost field-independent slopes. This implies

$$\Delta\sigma_{ab}(T, H) \propto \exp[-a(T - T_c(H))], \qquad (2)$$

where $a$ is some constant. A similar exponential decay of superconducting fluctuations has been reported for other cuprates [9, 31]. Even though an exponential decay does not follow explicitly from theoretical analysis of fluctuation conductivity [16], it allows an unambiguous determination of the characteristic temperature scale $T_c(H)$ from the relative shift of the curves along the $T$-axis with respect to the known $T_c(H = 0)$. Since the $\Delta\sigma_{ab}(T)$ curves in Figs. 1 (d) and (e) remain almost parallel at different $H$, such determination of $T_c(H)$ does not suffer from widening of the resistive transition, as in the flux-flow case at $T < T_c$ in Fig. 1 (a). Therefore, thus obtained $T_c(H)$ has the same degree of certainty as $T_c(H = 0)$.

Fig. 1 (f) represents a semi-logarithmic plot of $\Delta\sigma_{ab}R_n$ vs $H \perp ab$ for the OD(4.0) sample at $T = 1.8$ K and slightly above $T_c$ at $T = 4.2$ K. It is seen that $\Delta\sigma_{ab}(H)$ decays almost exponentially also as a function of field at constant $T$. In this case the relative shift along the horizontal axis provides the characteristic magnetic field scale for suppression of superconductivity $\sim H_{c2}$. Assuming that $H_{c2} = 0$ at $T = 4.2\ K \sim T_c$, we estimate from the relative shift of the two curves that $H_{c2}^{\perp}(T = 2\ K) \simeq 6$ T. This is consistent with $T_c(H^{\perp} = 6\ T) \simeq 2\ K$, estimated from $\Delta\sigma_{ab}(T)$ scaling in Fig. 1 (d). Thus, from the analysis of fluctuation conductivity we obtain a confident estimation of $T_c(H)$ or equivalently $H_{c2}(T)$.

Figure 2 (a) contains the main result of this work: obtained $T$-dependencies of $H_{c2}$. Blue and red squares represent $H_{c2}^{\perp}(T)$ for OD(4.0) and OP(4.3) crystals, respectively. Horizontal and vertical error bars correspond to the accuracy of scaling of $\Delta\sigma(T, H)$ curves according to Eq. (2). Filled circles represent $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T)$ for the OP(4.3) crystal. At low $T$ estimation of $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ is complicated by the lack of confident knowledge of $R_n(T)$. In Fig. 1 (e) we assumed $R_n^{\parallel}(T) = R_{ab}(H^{\parallel} = 17\ T)$. Alternatively we approximated $R_n$ from the linear extrapolation of $R_{ab}(H = 17\ T)$ at $T > 8$ K [$R_n(T) \simeq 2.1\ \Omega$]. $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ obtained this way is shown by stars. Up to $H^{\parallel} = 10$ T both approximations give the same $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T)$. Therefore, those values are confident. However, at $H > 12$ T results start to depend on the choice of $R_n(T)$. Unfortunately, none of the two approximations is good enough at $T \to 0$. Qualitatively, $R_n = R_{ab}(H^{\parallel} = 17\ T)$ tends to underestimate $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ because it assumes $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T = 0) = 17$ T. The linear extrapolation of $R_n(T > T_c)$ tends to overestimate $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T = 0)$ because it assumes that $R(H = H_{c2}) = R_n$. However, without the flux-flow phenomenon $R(H = H_{c2}) \simeq 0$ [9]. This is what we expect for our Lorentz force free data at $H \parallel ab$. In the absence of a better way to define $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ at low $T$, in Fig. 2 (a) we also show fields $H_{50\%}(T)$ at which middle points of resistive transitions occurs for in-plane (open circles) and c-axis (open rhombuses) resistances. Those points fall inbetween the underestimating (solid circles) and overestimating (stars) analysis of fluctuation conductivity. Therefore, they provide a reasonable estimate of $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ at low $T$.

From Fig. 2 (a) it is seen that $H_{c2}^{\perp}(T)$ and $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T)$ are qualitatively different. The $H_{c2}^{\perp}(T)$ is almost linear in the whole $T$-range $H_{c2}^{\perp}(T) \propto T_c - T$. Such a behavior is consistent with a conventional orbital upper critical field,

$$H_{c2}^{\perp} = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi\xi_{ab}^2}, \qquad (3)$$

where $\Phi_0$ is the flux quantum and $\xi_{ab}$ is the in-plane coherence length, $\xi_{ab}(0) = 5.5 \pm 0.2$ nm.

The $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T)$ is clearly non-linear. The dashed line in Fig. 2 (a) demonstrates that $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T) \propto \sqrt{T_c - T}$. At the first glance, it resembles the behavior of $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T)$ in thin film multilayers [28, 30],

$$H_{c2}^{\parallel} = \frac{\sqrt{3}\Phi_0}{\pi\xi_{ab}d}, \qquad (4)$$

where $d$ is the thickness of superconducting layers. However, the corresponding $d = 9.3 \pm 0.5$ nm is much larger than the thickness of CuO layers $\sim 0.2$ nm and is not connected to any geometrical length scale of the sample. Consequently, there is no agreement with Eq. (4).

The upper limit of $H_{c2}$ is determined by Pauli paramagnetism. The spin-singlet pairing is destroyed when the Zeeman spin-split energy becomes comparable to the




FIG. 2. (Color online) (a) Upper critical fields perpendicular (squares) and parallel to layers. Circles and stars represent estimations of $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ using different approximations for $R_n(T)$, open circles and open rhombuses represent middle points $H_{50\%}(T)$ of in-plane and out-of-plane resistive transitions, respectively, in parallel magnetic field. The dashed line represents the $\sqrt{T_c - T}$ dependence. Open triangles (right axis) represent $T$-dependence of the superconducting gap. (b) $T$-dependence of the anisotropy of the upper critical field $\gamma_H = H_{c2}^{\parallel}/H_{c2}^{\perp}$. It is seen that at low temperature it saturates at a small value $\gamma_H(0) \sim 2$. (c) Angular anisotropy of in-plane resistivity $R_{ab}(90°)/R_{ab}(0°)$ at $T = 2$K as a function of magnetic field. The anisotropy rapidly decreases with increasing $H$ as soon as the field approaches the paramagnetic limit.

superconducting energy gap $\Delta$. This gives [1]

$$H_p = \frac{\sqrt{2}\Delta}{g\mu_B}, \qquad (5)$$

where $g$ is the gyromagnetic ratio and $\mu_B$ is the Bohr magneton. In case of negligible spin-orbit coupling $g \simeq 2$ this yields $\mathrm{d}H_{c2}/\mathrm{d}T(T = T_c) = -2.25$ T/K for d-wave superconductors [32]. Our values $H_{c2}^{\perp}/T_c \simeq 2.5$ T/K and $\mid \mathrm{d}H_{c2}^{\perp}/\mathrm{d}T \mid (T = T_c) \simeq 5$ T/K and especially $H_{c2}^{\parallel}/T_c \simeq 5$ T/K and $\mid \mathrm{d}H_{c2}^{\parallel}/\mathrm{d}T \mid (T = T_c) > 40$ T/K clearly exceed this limit. Most importantly, $H_p$ does not depend on orientation of the field. Therefore, paramagnetically limited $H_{c2}$ should be isotropic, irrespective of the underlying effective mass anisotropy.

According to Eq.(5) $H_p$ is determined solely by $\Delta$. Open triangles in Fig. 2 (a) represent $\Delta(T)$-dependence measured by intrinsic tunneling spectroscopy [3] on a slightly underdoped crystal from the same batch [15]. It matches nicely $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T)$. Therefore, we conclude that the observed $H_{c2}^{\parallel}(T) \propto \sqrt{T_c - T}$ dependence is not originating from the geometrical confinement, Eq.(4), but follows the corresponding $\Delta(T)$ dependence of $H_p$, Eq.(5).

Fig. 2 (b) shows the anisotropy of the upper critical field $\gamma_H = H_{c2}^{\parallel}/H_{c2}^{\perp}$. Close to $T_c$ it diverges due to different $T$-dependencies of the two fields. However, at $T \ll T_c$ it shows a tendency for saturation at $\gamma_H(T \to 0) \sim 2$. Such a low anisotropy of $H_{c2}$ is remarkable for the layered Bi-2201 compound with $\gamma_m \sim 300$. Observation of the low anisotropy of $H_{c2}$ in the extremely anisotropic Bi-2201 cuprate is the central new result of this work.

In Fig. 2 (c) we show magnetic field dependence of the angular anisotropy $[R_{ab}(90°)/R_{ab}(0°)]^{1/2}$ obtained from the data in Fig. 1 (c). The anisotropy is large at low fields, but rapidly decreases at $H > 7$ T when the paramagnetic limitation starts to play a role. At high fields it tends to saturate at $\sim 2$, consistent with $\gamma_H$ in Fig. 2 (b). As mentioned above, paramagnetically limited $H_{c2}$ should be isotropic. Therefore, a finite residual anisotropy $\gamma_H(T \to 0) \sim 2$ indicates that only $H_{c2}^{\parallel}$ is paramagnetically limited, while $H_{c2}^{\perp}$ is still governed by orbital effects. Finally we note that $\gamma_H < \gamma_m$ was reported for several unconventional superconductors [6, 17, 18]. In particular, a nearly isotropic $H_{c2}$ was reported for the (Ba,K)$Fe_2As_2$ pnictide [33] despite a quasi-2D electronic structure. It is likely that all those observations have the same origin.

To conclude, we estimated $H_{c2}$ in the low-$T_c$ layered cuprate $Bi_{2.15}Sr_{1.9}CuO_{6+\delta}$, based on analysis of the fluctuation para-conductivity. Our main result is the observation of a low anisotropy of the upper critical field $\gamma_H(T \to 0) \simeq 2$, which is much smaller than the effective mass anisotropy $\gamma_m \sim 300$. This demonstrates that the anisotropy of $H_{c2}$ in unconventional superconductors may have nothing to do with the actual anisotropy of superconductivity at zero field. The large discrepancy in anisotropies serves instead as a robust evidence for paramagnetically limited superconductivity.

Technical support from the Core Facility in Nanotechnology at Stockholm University and useful discussions with M.V. Kartsovnik are gratefully acknowledged.

* E-mail: Vladimir.Krasnov@fysik.su.se

† present address: Institut für Luft und Kältetechnik gemeinnützige Gesellschaft mbH, Bertolt-Brecht-Allee 20, D-01309 Dresden, Germany.


[1] D. Saint-James, G. Sarma, and E.J. Thomas, Type-II superconductivity (Pergamon press 1969).

[2] V.G. Kogan and R. Prozorov, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 114502 (2012).

[3] V.M. Krasnov, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 214510 (2009).

[4] J.E. Hoffman, E. W. Hudson, K. M. Lang, V. Madhavan, H. Eisaki, S. Uchida, and J. C. Davis, *Science* **295**, 466 (2002).

[5] J. L. OBrien, et. al., *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 1584 (2000).

[6] T. Sekitani, N. Miura, S. Ikeda, Y.H. Matsuda, and Y. Shiohara, *Physica B* **346-347**, 319-324 (2004).

[7] S. I. Vedeneev, C. Proust, V.P. Mineev, M. Nardone, and G.L.J.A. Rikken, *Phys. Rev. B* **73**, 014528 (2006).

[8] P. Li, F. F. Balakirev, and R. L. Greene, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 172508 (2007).

[9] V.M. Krasnov, H. Motzkau, T. Golod, A. Rydh, S.O. Katterwe and A.B. Kulakov *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 054516 (2011).

[10] J. Chang, et. al., *Nature Phys.* **8**, 751 (2012).

[11] Y. Ando, A.N. Lavrov, and S. Komiya, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 247003 (2003).

[12] J.L. Tallon and J.W. Loram, *Physica C* **349**, 53 (2001).

[13] I.M. Vishik, et al., *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **109**, 18332 (2012).

[14] T. Kawakami, T. Shibauchi, Y. Terao, M. Suzuki, and L. Krusin-Elbaum, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 017001 (2005).

[15] Th. Jacobs, et.al., *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 214506 (2012).

[16] A. Glatz, A.A. Varlamov and V.M. Vinokur, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 104510 (2011).

[17] F. Zuo, J.S. Brooks, R.H. McKenzie, J.A. Schlueter and J.M. Williams, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 750 (2000).

[18] J.Singleton, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **63**, 1111 (2000).

[19] K. Cho, et al., *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 060502 (2011).

[20] S. Khim, B. Lee, J.W. Kim, E.S. Choi, G.R. Stewart, and K.H. Kim, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 104502 (2011).

[21] H. A. Radovan, N. A. Fortune, T. P. Murphy, S. T. Hannahs, E. C. Palm, S. W. Tozer, and D. Hall, *Nature* **425**, 51 (2003).

[22] Y. Matsuda and H. Shimahara, *J. Phys. Soc. Jap.* **76**, 051005 (2007).

[23] A.I. Buzdin and J.P. Brison, *Europhys. Lett.* **35**, 707 (1996).

[24] A. Yurgens, D. Winkler, T. Claeson, S. Ono and Y. Ando *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 147005 (2003).

[25] Y. Ando, G.S. Boebinger, A. Passner, N. L. Wang, C. Geibel, and F. Steglich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2065 (1996).

[26] T. Watanabe, T. Fujii, and A. Matsuda, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2113 (1997).

[27] B. Liang, A. Maljuk and C.T. Lin, *Physica C* **361**, 156 (2001).

[28] M. Tachiki, and S. Takahashi, *Solid St. Commun.* **70**, 291 (1989).

[29] W.K. Kwok, U.Welp, V.M. Vinokur, S. Fleshler, J. Downey, and G.W. Crabtree, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 390 (1991).

[30] V.M. Krasnov, A.E. Kovalev, V.A. Oboznov and N.F. Pedersen, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 15448 (1996).

[31] F. Rullier-Albenque, H. Alloul, and G. Rikken, *Phys. Rev. B* **84**, 014522 (2011).

[32] J. P. Carbotte, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **62**, 1027 (1990).

[33] H.Q. Yuan, et al., *Nature* **457**, 565 (2009).